REMARKS

This is responsive to the Office Action dated July 30, 2003 in which the Examiner rejects all the pending claims 1 -16 as either being anticipated by Norris (US Patent No. 5,557,748) under 35USC §102(b) or as being obvious over combinations of Norris, Aaker et al (US Patent No. 6,011,915) and Mosher et al (US Patent No. 6,029,143) under 35USC §103(a). The Examiner further rejects claims 2, 4, 5, 7 – 11 and 16 under 35USC §112. The Examiner also objects to the Abstract, and objects to the Declaration under 37CFR 1.52(c). Moreover, the Examiner requests that an IDS be submitted in accordance with 37CFR1.98 for the prior art described in the Specification.

Applicants have amended Abstract, which is now believed to have overcome the language deficiency as pointed out by the Examiner.

As to the IDS, the applicants believe that an IDS is not necessary to be submitted for the prior art described in the Specification as they are believed not material to the patentability of the pending claims as prescribed in CFR 1.56. Nonetheless, an IDS is being submitted herewith.

As to the objection to the Declaration, the applicants believe that the originally submitted Declaration is acceptable since there are no "interlineations, erasures, cancellations or other alterations of the application papers" that were made after the signing of the Oath or Declaration. Thus there is no need for any documents to be initialized or dated as required under 37CFR 1.52 (c). The applicants respectfully request that the originally submitted Declaration be accepted, and that the objection to the Declaration be withdrawn.

The applicants have amended claim 2 as well as cancelled claims 6 and 12 without prejudice, and believe that the basis of the rejections under 35USC §112 as to these claims has been removed.

As to the rejection to the claims 4, 5, 7-11 under 35USC §112, the applicants respectfully disagree with the assertion of the Examiner that the term "at least partially personalized" is not sufficiently described in the Specification so as to meet the enablement requirements under 35USC §112. Personalizing a server or client computer is a well-known technique in the art, which means installing or restoring data such as software settings, options, preferences, wallpapers, etc, so that the computer will be tailored to a particular user, as explained in the "Background Art" portion of the Specification (see page 1, lines 17-22). Here, "partially personalized" means that some but not all of the data has been installed or restored. For example, it may refer to a personalization stage that the server computer has been personalized with the software settings but has not been personalized with the wallpaper yet. Though the term "partially personalized" has not been described in great detail in the Specification, those skilled in the art can readily determine and realize such a "partially personalized" stage of the server or client computer without undue experimentation, The applicants believe that such a well-known technique need not be disclosed in detail and is best omitted. (see MPEP 2164.08). Therefore, the applicants believe that claims 4, 5, 7-11 meet the enablement requirements under 35USC §112.

As to the rejections to the claims under 35USC §102(b) and §103(a), the applicants respectfully traverse the rejections as explained in detail below.

First, the applicants believe a brief explanation of the present invention will be helpful in understanding the patentably distinguishing feature of the present invention as claimed over the cited patents. The present invention discloses a novel technique in personalizing a network having a server and at least one client. In particular, as taught by the present invention, both the personalization information for personalizing the server and the personalization information for personalizing the client are sent to the server, as defined in independent claims 1, 7 and 12. This

brings several efficiencies. For instance, the network needs a live connection only once to get the personalization information, and repetitive information that applies to multiple workstations is sent only once. (see page 13, lines 8-18). In a preferred embodiment, the personalization information is collected from existing server and client, and is sent to a new server and client replacing the existing server and client, as further defined in claim 12. Thus, the replacing server and/or client may function and look as the same as the replaced one.

The applicants do not agree with the assertion of the Examiner that the present invention as defined in independent claims 1, 7 and 12 is anticipated by Norris or are obvious over a combination of Norris and Aaker. In particular, neither of them discloses the distinguishing feature that both the personalization information for personalizing the server and the personalization information for personalizing the client are sent to the server, as defined in these claims.

Norris (US Patent No. 5,557,748) discloses a technique for dynamically configuring the network parameters of a computer system (e.g., a mobile computer device) when it connects to a network. In particular, upon initial connection of the mobile computer device to the network, user preferences and network parameters for other locations are read into the memory of the computer system, and network traffic data is gathered and indexed. Upon analysis of the current traffic data, participants, such as the local server, the default router, the printer, etc., are determined, which are further used to determine the location of the network by comparing the current participants list with the existing participants for previously observed locations. Upon determination of the location, the network parameters of the location is used to configure the mobile computer device, or, if it is a new location, at least certain network parameters can be acquired from the indexed traffic data (see col. 2, lines 3-37).

Contrary to the assertion of the Examiner, however, nowhere in Norris can it be found a teaching or implication that both the personalization information for personalizing the server and the personalization information for personalizing the client are sent to the server. In fact, Norris never teaches to configure a server in the network, and never teaches to send the personalization information (read as "network parameters") for personalizing the mobile computer device (read as "client") to a server (e.g., the local server). Norris only discloses how to configure the mobile computer device, which is clearly a client but not a server (see, e.g., col. 7, lines 34-37).

Aaker et al (US Patent No. 6,011,915) does not teach or imply the above emphasized distinguishing feature of the present invention either. What Asker discloses is a solution to replace actual, physical terminals with virtual terminal applications. In particular, the replacing processor can communicate with the hardware specific software within the central server through communications software which emulates the hardware attributes of the replaced terminals. Nowhere can it be found a teaching or disclosure that both the personalization information for personalizing the server and the personalization information for personalizing the client are sent to the server. Similarly, Mosher et al (US Patent No. 6,029,143) does not disclose this distinguishing feature of the present invention as defined in independent claims 1, 7 and 12 too.

Therefore, the applicants believe that independent claims 1, 7 and 12 are patentable because the above underlined distinguishing feature is not disclosed or implied in any of the cited patents. At least for the same reasons, dependent claims 2-5, 8-11 and 13-15 are also patentable as each of them includes all the limitations of one of the three independent claims.

Thus, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the claims in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks. The Examiner is authorized to deduct additional fees believed due from our Deposit Account No. 11-0223.

Respectfully submitted,

Kaplan & Gilman, L.L.P.
900 Route 9 North
Woodbridge, NJ 07095
Telephone 732-634-7634

Jeffrey I. Kaplan
(Reg. No. 34,356)

October 30, 2003

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal service as first class mail, in a postage prepaid envelope, addressed to Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on October 30, 2003.

Dated October 30, 2003 Signed 10/30/03 Print Name Jeffrey I. Kaplan